

MPI-Ph/93-48  
 TUM-TH-158/93  
 hep-th/9307171

July 1993

# String Unification and Threshold Corrections\*

P. Mayr , H.P. Nilles and S. Stieberger

*Physik Department  
 Institut für Theoretische Physik  
 Technische Universität München  
 D-85748 Garching, Germany*

and

*Max-Planck-Institut für Physik  
 —Werner-Heisenberg-Institut—  
 P.O. Box 401212  
 D-80805 München, Germany*

## ABSTRACT

The interpretation of the apparent unification of gauge couplings within supersymmetric theories depends on uncertainties induced through heavy particle thresholds. While in standard grand unified theories these effects can be estimated easily, the corresponding calculations are quite complicated in string unified theories and do exist only in models with unbroken  $E_6$ . We present results for heavy particle thresholds in more realistic models with gauge group  $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ . Effects of Wilson line background fields as well as the universal part of the (rather mild) threshold corrections indicate a strong model dependence. We discuss the consequences of our results for the idea of string unification without a grand unified gauge group.

---

\* Partially supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and the EC under contract no. SC1-CT92-0789.

An appealing concept for the extension of the successful standard model (SM) to higher energy scales is the idea of grand unified theories (GUTS). They provide a useful tool to gain knowledge about new physics up to the unification scale  $M_X$ . The evolution of the gauge couplings according to the renormalization group equations (RGE) is determined by the particle spectrum below  $M_X$ ; therefore the gauge couplings are sensitive detectors for the presence of each particle with nontrivial gauge quantum numbers. In the context of the minimal supersymmetric extension of the standard model (MSSM) the extrapolation of the low-energy data for the  $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$  gauge couplings is consistent with grand unification at a scale of  $M_X \approx 2 \cdot 10^{16} \text{ GeV}$  [1]. This agreement could serve as an argument for the existence of a unified gauge group as e.g.  $SU(5)$ ,  $SO(10)$  or  $E_6$  above the unification scale  $M_X$ .

Unfortunately the reliability of this result is weakened by the presence of uncertainties due to threshold effects at large scales [2]. In the presence of large group representations, e.g. a  $\underline{75}$  in  $SU(5)$  models [3], these corrections can acquire a considerable size and disturb seriously this successful picture. Moreover there are deep conceptual problems peculiar to supersymmetric GUTS: the avoidance of too fast proton decay raises the well-known problem of doublet-triplet splitting leading to a revival of the mass hierarchy problem whose removal was one of the primary motivations for the introduction of supersymmetry. In addition the boundary conditions for the Yukawa couplings at  $M_X$  forced by the group structure put serious constraints on the fermion mass spectrum. Finally these theories are to be embedded in a more complete theory at the natural high energy scale  $M_{Planck}$  where gravitational quantum effects can no longer be neglected.

Amazingly superstring theories, the only known theories which consistently unify all known interactions including gravity, show likewise the feature of gauge coupling unification. At the string scale  $M_{string} \approx 0.7 \cdot g_{string} \cdot 10^{18} \text{ GeV}$  [4, 5] the gauge coupling constants of the various group factors are related to the gravitational coupling constant  $G_N$  at tree level as follows [6]:

$$g_a^2 k_a = 4\pi\alpha'^{-1} G_N = g_{string}^2, \quad \forall a, \quad (1)$$

where  $\alpha'^{-1/2}$  is the string tension and  $k_a$  is the Kac-Moody level of the group factor labeled by  $a$ . Below  $M_{string}$  effective theories are an appropriate description of the low-energy physics and the couplings begin to evolve according to the RGE as in ordinary field theories. At the one-loop level the above equation is modified to [7, 4]

$$\frac{16\pi^2}{g_a^2(\mu)} = k_a \frac{16\pi^2}{g_{string}^2} + b_a \ln \left( \frac{M_{string}^2}{\mu^2} \right) + \Delta_a, \quad (2)$$

where  $b_a$  are the coefficients of the  $\beta$ -function via  $\beta_a = b_a g_a^3 / 16\pi^2$ .

String theories in four dimensions do not necessarily require the presence of a grand unified gauge group at  $M_X$ . This fact could be used for the most elegant solution of the so-called doublet-triplet splitting (or missing partner mechanism):

there is no need for the partner triplet to exist. In addition the constraints on the Yukawa couplings need not be imposed. On the other hand the unification scale  $M_X$  is now shifted to  $M_{string}$  and therefore differs by a factor of approximately 25 from the extrapolation of the gauge couplings according to the MSSM particle content. Again there are uncertainties due to thresholds corrections. Possibly they might resolve the discrepancy between  $M_X$  and  $M_{string}$ . But on the other hand there is likewise no reason that the gauge couplings will meet at some intermediate scale if they are split by the thresholds at the string scale. Below we shall give arguments that there are stringy threshold corrections which conserve gauge coupling unification for all group factors present in a certain model.

There has been considerable progress in the computation of threshold corrections in string theories [4]. In particular explicit results have been obtained in heterotic string models based on orbifolds [8, 9] and fermionic [10] constructions as well as in type II superstrings [11]. Surprisingly it was found that generically the threshold effects cause only a minor change of the unification scale  $M_X$  smaller than 5% [4, 11]. This was unexpected because there are thousands of heavy states which could a priori contribute huge corrections since they are not arranged in representations of a unifying gauge group. Therefore these string constructions involve remarkably mild threshold effects. There are two exceptions of this proper behavior. First the fermionic model of ref. [10]. Secondly the moduli dependent threshold corrections of ref. [8], present in certain orbifold models can grow even larger for sizeable VEV's of the moduli fields. This is because states with non-trivial windings and momenta in the internal dimensions have masses depending on the shape of the internal manifold which in turn is parametrized by the moduli. For large VEV's of some modulus complete string mass levels are pushed below the string scale and give rise to considerable threshold effects. On the other hand these kind of corrections are only present in orbifold models with so-called  $N = 2$  sectors as was explained in refs. [8].

In the following we specialize to orbifold constructions [12]. It is important to note that the up to now discussed threshold corrections are limited to the case of models with a (2,2) supersymmetry on the worldsheet and a symmetry group  $SL(2, Z)$  for the duality transformations on the moduli manifold. However it is known that the discrete symmetry group  $\Gamma$  acting in the moduli space is generically different from  $SL(2, Z)$  as was shown in [13] for a certain Calabi-Yau compactification and in [14] for a special  $\mathbf{Z}_3$  orbifold. Recently the computation of the moduli dependent threshold corrections was extended to a large class of orbifold models with the result that even in these rather simple toy models the duality group  $\Gamma$  can be at most a certain discrete subgroup of  $SL(2, Z)$  [9]. These constructions are yet far from giving semi-realistic models of our world since they have necessarily large gauge groups like  $E_6$  or  $E_7$  and an unrealistic particle spectrum. To get smaller gauge groups one introduces background gauge fields corresponding to Wilson lines with abelian [15] or non-abelian [16] embedding of the space group into the gauge degrees of freedom. In addition one chooses a non-standard embedding of the orb-

ifold twist and as a consequence these models will possess only (2,0) supersymmetry on the worldsheet. New moduli fields, defined in general as marginal deformations of the conformal field theory describing the two-dimensional string sigma model, will give rise to additional threshold effects parametrized by the VEV's of these fields.

In general it is quite complicated to calculate these corrections because of technical difficulties. While it is relatively easy to derive a formal expression for them there is no known general way to perform the final  $\tau$ -integration over the modular parameter of the torus. Still there remains the possibility to do a numerical calculation. The disadvantage of this method is the difficulty to include continuous deformations of the theory. Therefore, as a first step, we focus on discrete changes in the background values of certain gauge fields. Of course this choice will exclude the possibility of getting large threshold corrections by the choice of appropriate large VEV's for some Wilson line moduli as it was the case for the moduli dependent threshold corrections. Nevertheless our model has at least a reasonable gauge group structure and will provide some knowledge about the situation in more realistic models.

The partition function for the  $\mathbf{Z}_3$  orbifold with discrete Wilson lines is given by

$$Z = \frac{1}{N} \left[ Z_{0,0} + \sum_{m,n} \eta(n,m) Z_{m,n} \right] , \quad (3)$$

where  $Z_{0,0}$  is the partition function of the torus [17] and  $Z_{m,n}$  is that of a sector twisted by  $\Theta^m$  ( $\Theta^n$ ) in the  $\sigma$  ( $\tau$ ) direction of the torus:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{m,n} &= \int_{\tau \in \Gamma} \frac{d^2\tau}{\tau_2^2} \frac{1}{2\pi\tau_2} Z_L(m,n) \bar{Z}_R(m,n) \bar{C}(m,n,\xi) \\ &\times \sum_{v' \in \hat{v}} \tilde{C}(m,n,\xi,\hat{v}) Z_{E_8}(m,n,v'_1) Z_{E_8}(m,n,v'_2) , \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Z_L(m,n) &= \frac{\eta}{\prod_{\alpha=2}^4 \vartheta \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} 1/2 + m \xi_\alpha \\ 1/2 + n \xi_\alpha \end{smallmatrix} \right]} , \\ \bar{Z}_R(m,n) &= \frac{\sum_{\alpha,\beta} \eta_{\alpha\beta} \prod_{\alpha=1}^4 \bar{\vartheta} \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha + m \xi_\alpha \\ \beta + n \xi_\alpha \end{smallmatrix} \right]}{\prod_{\alpha=2}^4 \bar{\vartheta} \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} 1/2 + m \xi_\alpha \\ 1/2 + n \xi_\alpha \end{smallmatrix} \right] \bar{\eta}^3} , \\ Z_{E_8}(m,n,v) &= \frac{\sum_{\alpha,\beta} \eta_{\alpha\beta}(m,n) \prod_{I=1}^8 \vartheta \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha + m v^I \\ \beta + n v^I \end{smallmatrix} \right]}{\eta^8} . \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Here  $\tau = \tau_1 + i\tau_2$  is the single Teichmüller parameter of the torus,  $\bar{C}(m,n,\xi)$  and  $\tilde{C}(m,n,\xi,\hat{v})$  are numerical factors which take care of the degeneracy of the fixed

points [18, 19],  $\eta(m, n)$ ,  $\eta_{\alpha\beta}$  and  $\eta_{\alpha\beta}(m, n)$  are phase factors determined from modular invariance and  $\vartheta$  and  $\eta$  are Jacobi and Dedekind functions.  $\xi_\alpha = 1/3(0, 1, 1, -2)$  is the shift vector describing the boundary conditions of the space-time degrees of freedom and the shift  $v^I$  in the gauge sector has been split into two parts,  $v'_1$ ,  $v'_2$  acting in the two  $E_8$  factors. The sum in eq. (4) runs over the following set of shift vectors:

$$\hat{v} = \left\{ v' : v' = v + \sum_{k=1}^{\omega} s^k a_k^I, s^k \in \{0, 1, -1\} \right\}, \quad (6)$$

where  $\omega$  is the number of independent Wilson lines. Note that in general the phases inside a  $E_8$  factor depend on the sector  $(\Theta^m, \Theta^n)$ .

The expressions given above apply immediately also to other  $\mathbf{Z}_N$  orbifolds if they are supplemented by the contributions of the internal zero-modes in sectors with fixed tori as was explained in ref. [20].

The threshold corrections are given by a slight deformation of the above partition function [4]:

$$\Delta_a = \int_{\tau \in \Gamma} \frac{d^2\tau}{\tau_2} (\mathcal{B}_a(\tau, \bar{\tau}) - b_a), \quad (7)$$

where  $b_a = \mathcal{B}_a(\tau = i\infty)$ . Apart from factors of  $\tau_2$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_a$  differs from the previously given partition function only by insertions of two kinds of charge operators. One of them acts in the fermionic space-time degrees of freedom and is sensitive to the Lorentz representation of a certain state. The other one is inserted in the gauge degrees of freedom and counts the charge of the state with respect to a specific Cartan generator of the gauge group. Both insertions can be taken into account by the use of the following modified  $\vartheta$  functions:

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta'' \begin{bmatrix} \theta \\ \phi \end{bmatrix} (\tau) &= \sum_n (n + \theta)^2 q^{(n+\theta)^2/2} e^{2\pi i(n+\theta)\phi}, \\ \vartheta' \begin{bmatrix} \theta \\ \phi \end{bmatrix} (\tau) &= \sum_n (n + \theta) q^{(n+\theta)^2/2} e^{2\pi i(n+\theta)\phi}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

In general the insertion of the charge operator with respect to a certain Cartan generator requires the replacement of a factor  $Z_{E_8}$  in the partition function by a linear combination of deformed  $Z_{E_8}$  factors with the above modifications in the appropriate  $\vartheta$  functions. The concrete expression can be most easily obtained in a basis of the gauge lattice where the non-abelian gauge groups are in one-to-one correspondence with definite  $\vartheta$  functions.

As a concrete model we consider the  $\mathbf{Z}_3$  orbifold with gauge group  $[SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)^5] \times [SO(10) \times U(1)^3]'$  constructed in ref. [21] and further elaborated in ref. [22]. The model is defined by the shift vector  $v$  and two Wilson lines  $a_1^I$  and  $a_3^I$ :

$$v^I = \frac{1}{3}(1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 2 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0)(2 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
a_1^I &= \frac{1}{3}(0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 2)(0\ 1\ 1\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0) , \\
a_3^I &= \frac{1}{3}(1\ 1\ 1\ 2\ 1\ 0\ 1\ 1)(1\ 1\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0) .
\end{aligned}
\tag{9}$$

The massless spectrum of this model was given in detail in ref. [22].

We computed numerically the threshold corrections with respect to the gauge group factors  $SU(3)$ ,  $SU(2)$ ,  $SO(10)$  and one  $U(1)$ . The  $U(1)$  we have chosen is that one denoted by  $U_5$  in [22]. A special property of eq. (7) is the fact that it applies not to a single threshold correction to a gauge coupling but only to the difference of such corrections w.r.t. two different gauge couplings. Therefore, to be precise, we have computed in this way the relative threshold corrections  $\Delta_{a-b} \equiv \Delta_a - \Delta_b$ . The coefficients  $b_a$  of the  $\beta$ -function are

$$b_{SU(3)} = 9, \quad b_{SU(2)} = 18, \quad b_{SO(10)} = -18, \quad b_{U(1)} = 32 , \tag{10}$$

where we have normalized the quadratic Casimir of the gauge group as  $\text{tr}(Q_a^2) = 1/2$  (1) for  $SU(N)$  ( $SO(N)$ ).

To minimize the numerical errors which could possibly arise because of cancellations of large terms, we first calculated analytically the power series in  $e^{-\pi\tau_2}$  of the difference of the modified partition functions. The rapid convergence of this series can be easily checked with the standard methods of analysis. Afterwards we integrated this series numerically over the fundamental region  $\Gamma$ .

We found the surprising result that all relative threshold corrections are identical after division by the difference of the  $\beta$ -function coefficients:

$$\Delta \equiv \frac{\Delta_a - \Delta_b}{b_a - b_b} \approx 0.079 . \tag{11}$$

Remarkably this result implies that the running couplings of all gauge groups meet in one point in spite of the fact that they are no longer equal at the string scale  $M_{string}$ . To gain insight into the structure of the threshold corrections we make the following ansatz:

$$\Delta_a = b_a \cdot \Delta + k_a Y , \quad k_a = 1 . \tag{12}$$

This relation is motivated by the above mentioned fact that the formula (7) determines a single threshold correction only up to a group independent additive term  $Y$ . Checking the expressions for the separate threshold corrections  $\Delta_a$  for  $a \in \{SU(3), SU(2), U(1)_5, SO(10)\}$  we find that ansatz (12) is justified. We are then able to determine the value of the gauge group independent term to be

$$Y \approx 4.41 . \tag{13}$$

The outcome that the single threshold corrections  $\Delta_a$  can be written as in eq. (12) is a highly non-trivial one, the general form being  $\Delta_a = \tilde{\Delta}_a + k_a Y$ . Where does this result come from? The history of string theory shows that modular invariance

is quite often the root of such surprising relations. Indeed also in computations of moduli dependent threshold corrections [8, 9] this symmetry was responsible for the fact that the final expression appeared to be a  $\tau$ -integral over the fundamental region multiplied by the difference of the  $\beta$ -function coefficients of the  $N = 2$  supersymmetric sector of the theory. Therefore modular invariance could be a plausible candidate to explain this feature of the relative threshold corrections and might be a hint for an analytic calculation of this quantity in  $N = 1$  supersymmetric sectors as well as in models with Wilson lines.

Another peculiarity of the quantity  $\Delta$  in (11), which is the relevant one for the discussion of gauge coupling unification, is its size. Indeed it was found in ref. [4] that for the standard  $\mathbf{Z}_3$  orbifold with gauge group  $E_8 \times SU(3) \times E_6$  the relative threshold correction w.r.t. the gauge groups  $SU(3)$  and  $E_6$  is zero while that w.r.t.  $E_8$  and  $SU(3)$  results in a correction  $\Delta$  almost equal to that found in our complicated model. Moreover, for the  $\mathbf{Z}_3$  orbifold with non-standard embedding and gauge group  $[E_6 \times SU(3)]^2$  the relative threshold corrections  $\Delta_{E_6-SU(3)}$  yield a  $\Delta$  of the same size as that of the standard  $\mathbf{Z}_3$  orbifold.

To investigate further this issue we analyzed two additional  $\mathbf{Z}_3$  orbifolds, the standard  $\mathbf{Z}_3$  orbifold with gauge group  $E_8 \times SU(3) \times E_6$  mentioned above as well as a  $\mathbf{Z}_3$  orbifold with one Wilson line and gauge group  $[E_6 \times SU(3)]^2$  constructed in ref. [15]. Note that this second model has nothing to do with the  $\mathbf{Z}_3$  orbifold of ref. [4] with the same gauge group but constructed without a Wilson line. First it should be regarded as the standard  $\mathbf{Z}_3$  orbifold with a non-vanishing vacuum expectation value for certain background gauge fields. Secondly the particle spectrum is different from that of the model without a Wilson line.

As a result we got that the power series which describes the relative threshold corrections before integrating over the fundamental region starts with the same term in all models under consideration after division by the difference of the coefficients  $b_a$ . This is not true for the terms of higher order in  $e^{-\pi\tau_2}$  which depend on the specific model. Since the series converges very rapidly these differences cause only minor changes in the total value of the threshold corrections. We have no explanation for this agreement but it might well be that this common first term is a reflection of the fact that all our models are based on the  $\mathbf{Z}_3$  orbifold.

The threshold correction (11) amounts to a small increase in the effective unification scale  $M_X$  of about 4%. Apart from the fact that the shift of  $M_X$  goes in the opposite direction, its size is too small to explain the missing factor of 25 between  $M_X$  and  $M_{string}$ . On the other hand it is comparable in size to the threshold corrections which arise from the shift  $v$  associated to the twist  $\Theta$  [4]. Since the Wilson line appears also in the internal momenta in sectors with extended supersymmetry, quite similar to the moduli fields describing the shape of the internal manifold, the natural size of the Wilson line dependent threshold corrections from these sectors should be comparable to that of the moduli dependent ones. Moreover we have seen from the two standard  $\mathbf{Z}_3$  models – with and without Wilson line – that the Wilson line dependent threshold corrections give *additional* contributions: the relative

thresholds  $\Delta_{E_6-SU(3)}$  of the standard  $\mathbf{Z}_3$  with vanishing background values for the gauge fields are zero, while they are not for a non-trivial background configuration.

Let us discuss now the prospect of orbifold models to give proper string unification compatible with the phenomenological observations. To do this one has of course to take into account all kinds of (threshold) effects which influence the running of the gauge couplings. A classification of orbifold models w.r.t. consistency with experiments was done in refs. [23]. The basic assumption was the existence of an orbifold model with standard model gauge group and the massless particle content of the MSSM. Subsequently the properties of such a hypothetical model were discussed in the context  $\mathbf{Z}_N$  and  $\mathbf{Z}_N \times \mathbf{Z}_M$  [24] orbifolds. In this way a large class of orbifolds have been ruled out to give phenomenologically interesting models.

On the other hand the authors of refs. [23] considered only threshold corrections calculated for (2,2) models and thus unbroken  $E_6$  gauge symmetry. In contrast an orbifold model with standard model gauge group is believed to be necessarily a (2,0) model including an appropriate choice of Wilson lines. Our above reasonings show that there will be additional threshold effects. In particular these corrections should become sizeable in models with  $N = 2$  supersymmetric sectors. Since the expression for the Wilson line dependent threshold corrections coming from these sectors is not known, no statement can be made about their possible effects. Moreover, one has to take into account the mechanism which lowers the rank of the gauge group. Continuous Wilson lines might be one possibility, but a more general mechanism might also involve the anomalous  $U(1)$  factor present in many (2,0) models [25, 22]. The anomalous  $U(1)$  will be broken [26] and during this process otherwise massless particles might acquire a nontrivial mass that depends on the details of the model. These states will heavily change the evolution of the gauge couplings and indeed it was shown in refs. [27] that the experimental requirements can be met if certain conditions on their mass spectrum are fulfilled. Note that the effective massless particle content below the mass scale of these states will be given by that of the MSSM.

Indeed, one might ask the question, whether a consistent and realistic string model exists in which the states lighter than the Planck mass are exactly those of MSSM. In fact the additional "massless" states usually present in orbifold models are quite appropriate to play the role of particles at an intermediate mass scale as considered in refs. [27]. Therefore a reasonable physics requirement for a model might be to ask for the massless particle content of the MSSM at low energies and not at the string scale.

This has also consequences for the discussion of anomaly freedom of the effective theory w.r.t. target space duality transformations on the moduli space of the internal manifold. The anomaly coefficient of the mixed gauge-duality anomalies depends on the properties of the massless states under these transformations which is described by the so-called modular weights. In a completely twisted plane – the so-called  $N = 1$  sector – the anomaly coefficient has to be common to all gauge groups to be cancelled by a universal Green-Schwarz counterterm [5]. This gives a



condition on the modular weights of gauge group non-singlets. These states, massive at an intermediate mass scale but massless at the level of the string construction, contribute to the anomaly coefficient with their modular weights. Therefore one should not impose the condition of anomaly freedom on the massless particle spectrum of the low energy phase – that of the MSSM – but on the massless spectrum at the string scale which includes the additional states.

There are two more general difficulties in the discussion of duality anomalies. They both have to do with the definition of the modular weights of the matter fields. The first is the exact form (and knowledge) of the quantum symmetry group  $\Gamma$  itself. As already mentioned  $\Gamma$  is given by  $SL(2, Z)$  only in the simplest models[14, 9]. Therefore it is not known whether the above concept can be applied to more sophisticated models involving non-standard embedding and a set of continuous and/or discrete Wilson lines, where  $\Gamma$  is not explicitly known and might be inappropriate for a useful definition of the modular weights. The second difficulty in the definition of the modular weights is the explicit knowledge of the moduli dependent Kähler matter metric  $K_M(T_i, \bar{T}_i)$ , where  $T_i$  denotes a chiral superfield containing a modulus of the internal manifold. All derivations of this function are based on a (2,2) supersymmetry on the worldsheet [28]. Therefore the application of these results to (2,0) models has to be noticed as an important assumption. Nevertheless interesting results have been obtained in refs. [23] using naively the matter metric derived for (2,2) models.

We have thus seen that the discussion of the properties of realistic string models is far from being conclusive. The same can be said about the interpretation of the apparent unification of gauge coupling constants. In its simplest form it would favor a standard GUT with  $M_X \geq 10^{16}\text{GeV}$ . Realistic versions of such grand unified theories, however, require many heavy particles and threshold effects due to such particles could change the successful predictions. In addition  $M_X$  seems to be quite close to the Planck scale and the influence of the gravitational interactions could become important. One might therefore consider gauge coupling unification in string theory as a possible alternative scenario. Also there we have to deal with many heavy states and threshold effects. One interesting aspect of string unification is the fact that it does not require a unified gauge group. Unification of gauge coupling constants at the tree level is a universal property of any string model, with or without a grand unified group, due to the universal coupling of the dilaton. This fact, however, could be changed by quantum effects and one might worry whether realistic string models do predict gauge coupling unification. The results of the calculation presented in this paper indicate a more general validity of the tree level result. Corrections are mild and seem to effect different gauge couplings in a similar way (see eq. (11)). Of course, there still remains the question concerning the unification scale as compared to the string unified scale. This question, however, can probably only be answered with the knowledge of the heavy particle spectrum. A distinction between the two scenarios from a low energy point of view could come

from the investigation of Yukawa-coupling unification and its role in MSSM. While in standard GUTS such a unification (e.g. bottom-tau Yukawa coupling degeneracy at  $M_X$ ) is in general expected, no such statement can be made in string unified models, although the possibility cannot be ruled out. Thus the situation remains inconclusive.

### Acknowledgements

One of us (P.M.) would like to thank Albrecht Klemm for useful discussions.

## References

- [1] J. Ellis, S. Kelley and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B 249 (1990) 441;  
U. Amaldi, W. de Boer and H. Fürstenau, Phys. Lett. B 260 (1991) 447;  
P. Langacker and M.X. Luo, Phys. Rev. D 44 (1991) 817
- [2] P. Langacker and N. Polonsky, Phys. Rev. D 47 (1993) 4028 and references therein
- [3] K. Hagiwara and Y. Yamada, Phys.Rev.Lett. 70 (1993) 709
- [4] V. Kaplunovsky, Nucl. Phys. B 307 (1988) 145
- [5] J.P. Derendinger, S. Ferrara, C. Kounnas and F. Zwirner, Nucl. Phys. B 372 (1992) 145
- [6] P. Ginsparg, Phys. Lett. B 197 (1987) 139
- [7] S. Weinberg, Phys. Lett. B 91 (1980) 51
- [8] L. Dixon, V. Kaplunovsky and J. Louis, Nucl. Phys. B 355 (1991) 649;  
I. Antoniadis, K.S. Narain and T.R. Taylor, Phys. Lett. B 267 (1991) 37
- [9] P. Mayr and S. Stieberger, Munich preprint MPI-PH-93/07 (1993), hep-th/9303017, to appear in Nucl. Phys. B
- [10] I. Antoniadis, J. Ellis, R. Lacaze and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B 268 (1991) 188;
- [11] L. Dolan and J.T. Liu, Nucl. Phys. B 387 (1992) 86
- [12] L. Dixon, J. Harvey, C. Vafa and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B 261 (1985) 678; Nucl. Phys. B 274 (1986) 285;  
L. E. Ibáñez, J. Mas, H. P. Nilles and F. Quevedo, Nucl. Phys. B 301 (1988) 157
- [13] P. Candelas, X.C. de la Ossa, P. S. Green and L. Parkes, Phys. Lett. B 258 (1991) 118;  
P. Candelas, X.C. de la Ossa, P. S. Green and L. Parkes, Nucl. Phys. B 359 (1991) 21
- [14] J. Erler and M. Spalinski, Munich preprint MPI-PH-92/61 (1992), hep-th/9208038;  
J. Erler, PhD thesis, Munich preprint MPI-PH-92/21 (1992)
- [15] L. E. Ibáñez, H. P. Nilles and F. Quevedo, Phys. Lett. B 187 (1987) 25
- [16] L. E. Ibáñez, H. P. Nilles and F. Quevedo, Phys. Lett. B 192 (1987) 332
- [17] K. S. Narain, M. H. Sarmadi and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B 279 (1987) 369
- [18] L. E. Ibáñez, J. Mas, H. P. Nilles and F. Quevedo, Nucl. Phys. B 310 (1988) 157
- [19] A. Font, L. E. Ibáñez, F. Quevedo and A. Sierra, Nucl. Phys. B 331 (1990) 421
- [20] J. Erler and A. Klemm, Comm. Math. Phys. 153 (1993) 579
- [21] L. E. Ibáñez, J. E. Kim, H. P. Nilles and F. Quevedo, Phys. Lett. B 191 (1987) 282
- [22] J. A. Casas, E. K. Katehou and C. Muñoz, Nucl. Phys. B 317 (1989) 171

- [23] L. E. Ibáñez, D. Lüst and G.G. Ross, Phys. Lett. B 272 (1991) 251;  
L. E. Ibáñez and D. Lüst, Nucl. Phys. B 382 (1992) 305
- [24] A. Font, L. E. Ibáñez and F. Quevedo, Phys. Lett. B 217 (1989) 272
- [25] A. Font, L. E. Ibáñez, H.P. Nilles and F. Quevedo, Nucl. Phys. B 307 (1988) 109
- [26] M. Dine, N. Seiberg and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B 289 (1987) 585
- [27] A.E. Faraggi, Weizmann preprint WIS-92/17/FEB-PH (1993), hep-ph/9301268 ;  
M.K. Gaillard and R. Xiu, California preprint UCB-PTH-92/15, hep-th/9206206
- [28] L. Dixon, V. Kaplunovsky and J. Louis Nucl. Phys. B 329 (1990) 27;  
M. Cvetič, J. Molera and B.A. Ovrut, Phys. Rev. D 40 (1989) 1140